UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,089	11/14/2003	Kuang Yang	TOP 342	8213

23995   7590   07/13/2007

RABIN & Berdo, PC
1101 14TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/712,089	YANG, KUANG
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Philip B. Tran	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10 and 12-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10 and 12-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Notice to Applicant

1.   This communication is in response to amendment filed April 06 2006. Claims 2, 11 and 19-20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 12-15 and 17 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1, 3-10 and 12-18 are pending for further examination.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to because Figure No. 5 has a typo error on item reference 271 (it should read "Object Pool").

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Blumenau et al (hereafter, Blumenau), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US

2001/0020254 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Blumenau teaches an object management system (=

managing access to storage devices in a storage system with access control) [see

Abstract], comprising:

a plurality of ports, wherein each port has respective authority for transmission

therefrom to at least one of the ports [see Figs. 1A-1C and Abstract and Paragraphs

0175 & 0182] ;

an object access interface to receive an access request from at least one entity

corresponding to at least one of the ports, wherein the access request includes at least

an identification of the entity that issued the access request, a source port, a destination

port, object information and access content comprising a write command (= interfacing

the hosts and the storage system for receiving requests to manage data accesses to

the storage system comprising a write command) [see Figs. 1A-1C and Paragraphs

0044 & 0098 & 0177 & 0182];

a resource management module to assign a command handler to the access

request (= identifying command requests) [see Paragraphs 0136-0137 & 0167];

an access management module to determine authority of the access request

according to the identification and the source port to determine whether the entity that

issued the access request has the authority of transmission with the destination port (=

determining authorization of access request) [see Abstract and Paragraphs 0010-0011

& 0182]; and

an object management module to write an object corresponding to the object

information to the destination port according to the write command in the access content

if the entity that issued the access request has the authority, wherein the command

handler is released after the object is written to the destination port (= allowing data

access and ending the process) [see Fig. 26 and Paragraphs 0182-0185].

Regarding claim 3, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 1

wherein, when the access content further includes a permanent write command, and

the object management module further writes the object to an object storage according

to the permanent write command (= write command) [see Paragraphs 0177 & 0182].

Regarding claim 4, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 1

wherein the object management module further duplicates the object to a second object

management module (= mirroring or copying data) [see Paragraphs 0062 & 0123].

Regarding claim 5, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 1 wherein if the access content includes a read command, the object management module provides the object to the entity that issued the access request for reading if the entity that issued the access request has an authority to access the object (= read command) [see paragraphs 0172 & 0177 & 0182].

Regarding claims 6-7, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 1 wherein the access content includes a remove command, the object management module removes the object if the entity that issued the access request has an authority to access the object and wherein the object management module further notifies a second object management module to remove the object (= remove command) [see Paragraphs 0140 & 0152].

Regarding claim 8, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 1 wherein if the access content includes a retrieve command, the object management module provides the object to the entity that issued the access request has an authority to access the object, and locks the object such that the object is not available for any other entity (= retrieve command) [see Paragraphs 0009-0011 & 0065 & 0182].

Regarding claim 9, Blumenau further teaches the system as claimed in claim 8 wherein the object management module further releases the object after a preset time [see Paragraphs 0079-0080].

Claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 3.

Claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 4.

Claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 5.

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 6.

Claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 7.

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 8.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 9.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive
because of the following reasons:

A/ Applicant argued that Blumenau (U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US
2001/0020254 A1) fail to teach or suggest the feature of the transmission authority
between ports [see Page 8 of Remarks].

In response to applicant's argument, Blumenau discloses configuring access to a
specific port on a storage system from a specific port on a host system [see Blumenau,
Paragraphs 0032-0034]. In addition, Blumenau further discloses access control and
management routine for determining authorization of data access with granting or
denying communication between ports [see Blumenau, Figs. 1A-1C and Abstract and

Paragraphs 0175 & 0182]. Therefore, Blumenau does teach or suggest the feature of

the transmission authority between ports as claimed.

B/ Applicant argued that authorities in Applicant's arrangement and the

Blumenau reference are different and the Blumenau reference does not discloses that

authority is determined according to port as in Applicant's arrangement [see Page 8 of

Remarks].

In response to applicant's argument, Blumenau again discloses configuring

access to a specific port on a storage system from a specific port on a host system [see

Blumenau, Paragraphs 0032-0034]. In addition, Blumenau again further discloses

access control and management routine for determining authorization of data access

with granting or denying communication between ports [see Blumenau, Figs. 1A-1C and

Abstract and Paragraphs 0175 & 0182]. Moreover, Blumenau further discloses

identifiers of source and target devices are used for accessing data [see Blumenau,

Paragraphs 0047 & 0066-0070 & 0175]. Therefore, Therefore, Blumenau does teach or

suggest that authority is determined according to port as claimed.

C/ Applicant argued that the command handler as claimed is totally different than

what is disclosed in the Blumenau reference [see Page 8 of Remarks].

In response to applicant's argument, Blumenau discloses allowing data access

and ending the process [see Fig. 26 and Paragraphs 0182-0185]. Therefore, Blumenau

does teach or suggest the command handler as claimed.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the command handlers are similar to the tasks in an OS (Operating System) of computer science. A system may have several tasks running simultaneously. The number of the command handlers depends on the resources of the System) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, **988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).**

D/ Applicant argued that the objective of the Blumenau reference is to manage access to a storage system, and the Blumenau reference does not suggest or teach the feature of data transmission between ports writing object to the destination port of the invention [see Page 8 of Remarks].

In response to applicant's argument, Blumenau again discloses configuring access to a specific port on a storage system from a specific port on a host system [see Blumenau, Paragraphs 0032-0034]. In addition, Blumenau again further discloses access control and management routine for determining authorization of data access with granting or denying communication between ports [see Blumenau, Figs. 1A-1C and Abstract and Paragraphs 0175 & 0182]. Moreover, Blumenau further discloses reading data from or writing data to media storage locations [see Blumenau, Paragraphs 0044 & 0098 & 0177 & 0182]. Therefore, Blumenau does teach or suggest the feature of data transmission between ports writing object to the destination port as claimed.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that the cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims. Dependent claims are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10 and 12-18 are respectfully rejected as shown above.

Conclusion

6.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CAR 1.136(A) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT, HOWEVER, WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

8.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PHILIP TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2155
July 6, 2007